

Serial No. 09/458,321

Page 7 of 13

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed July 16, 2003. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 10-13, 15-18, and 20-29 are pending, of which claims 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29 stand rejected. By this response, claims 10, 17, and 23 have been amended, claims 11-13, 15-16, 18, 20-22, and 24-29 continue unamended, and claims 1-9, 14, and 19 are cancelled.

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all these claims are now in allowable form.

It is to be understood that the Applicants, by amending the claims, do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the prior art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant responsive amendments.

REJECTIONS**35 U.S.C. §103****Claims 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29**

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Shaw et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,391, issued August 15, 2000, hereinafter "Shaw") in view of Utsumi (U.S. Patent No. 6,155,677, issued February 27, 2001, hereinafter "Utsumi"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In particular, claim 10 recites:

" A method of adapting asset delivery within a heterogeneous multimedia video-on-demand distribution system having service provider equipment and at least one set top terminal, comprising the steps of:
determining at the service provider equipment, for each set top terminal (STT) requesting a session for video content in the multimedia video-on-demand distribution system, a capability level of said STT and a capability level of the distribution network;
selecting, from a plurality of available video content and navigational asset versions stored on said service provider equipment,

Serial No. 09/458,321
Page 8 of 13

one of said versions of video content and navigation assets appropriate to said capability level of said STT; and
providing, via at least one of a plurality of transmission channels,
said selected video content and navigational assets in response to STT communications indicative of a need for said video content and assets, said navigational assets comprise video information, graphics information, and control information, and wherein said STT being configured to selectively tune, downconvert, and depacketize said video content and assets received via said transmission channels." (emphasis added).

The test under 35 U.S.C. §103 is not whether an improvement or a use set forth in a patent would have been obvious or non-obvious; rather the test is whether the claimed invention, considered as a whole, would have been obvious. Jones v. Hardy, 110 U.S.P.Q. 1021, 1024 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). Thus, it is impermissible to focus either on the "gist" or "core" of the invention, Bausch & Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc., 230 U.S.P.Q. 416, 420 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Moreover, the invention as a whole is not restricted to the specific subject matter claimed, but also embraces its properties and the problem it solves. In re Wright, 6 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1959, 1961 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (emphasis added).

Neither the Shaw reference nor the Utsumi reference, either singularly or in combination, teach the Applicants' invention as a whole. In particular, the Shaw reference discloses:

"In a client-server architecture, an Adaptive Internet Protocol (AIP) system, comprised of a display engine operating on a server and a protocol engine operating on a server, providing means to support standard graphics based computer applications connected to clients of varying capability via a network of varying bandwidth and latency by automatically varying the type and number of graphic requests and their networking encoding to provide near optimum performance while maintaining the correct visual representation." (See Shaw, Abstract)

Nowhere in the Shaw reference is there any teaching or suggestion of "selecting, from a plurality of available video content and navigational asset versions stored on said service provider equipment, one of said versions of video content and navigational assets appropriate to said capability level of said STT," "providing via at least one of a plurality of transmission channels, said selected video content and navigational assets,"

Serial No. 09/458,321
Page 9 of 13

and "said STT being configured to selectively tune, downconvert, and depacketize said video content and assets received via said transmission channels." By contrast, the Shaw reference discloses a client server relationship as between a conventional application server and a client device such as a character based or window based or web user interface device. (See Shaw, column 2, lines 21-23). More specifically, Shaw discloses a client-server network that provides at least one application service for selection by a user via a client device having a display engine operating thereon. (See Shaw, column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 2). Nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion of a set top terminal, as defined by the Applicants.

A set top terminal (STT), as defined by the Applicants, is capable of processing video information streams and associated audio information streams provided via at least one of a plurality of transmission channels. In particular, "the STT is configured to selectively tune, downconvert, and depacketize" the user content and assets provided via at least one of a plurality of transmission channels. As shown in Figure 2 of the Applicants' invention, each receiver 204 and 210 contains a tuner, amplifiers, filters, a demodulator and a depacketizer. As such, the set-top terminal selectively tunes, downconverts, and depacketizes the signals from the cable network in a conventional manner (See Specification page 13, lines 16-19). Nowhere in the Shaw reference is there any teaching or suggestion that the client devices of Shaw selectively tune, downconvert, depacketize or operate in a similar manner as defined by the Applicants' set-top terminal.

In this instance, the Examiner has impermissibly picked and chose various limitations regarding display engines that determine support of display operations at the client devices, without considering that these client devices are not set top terminals as defined by the Applicants. That is, the client devices of Shaw discloses that the client devices generally include a PC, a Unix computer, a network computer, illustratively having a java virtual machine interface to a server having various engines or processors executing thereon. (See Shaw, column 5, lines 40-60 and Figure 1). Accordingly, the Shaw reference discloses client devices that are associated with windows and web browser-type applications, as opposed to the Applicants' invention, which is a set top

Serial No. 09/458,321

Page 10 of 13

terminal that tunes, demodulates and depacketizes video-on-demand information from a service provider.

Further, the Utsumi reference fails to bridge the substantial gap as between the Shaw reference and the Applicants' invention. In particular, the Utsumi reference merely discloses a data exchange process that performs a series of processing operations to convert data as an application service into another data in correspondence with the attribute of each terminal or communication infrastructure. (See Utsumi, column 14, lines 48-52 and Figure 2). Moreover, the terminal type determining section of Utsumi determines the type of user terminal (e.g. a large screen desk top PC, a portable small screen sub-notebook PC, and PDA). (See column 14, line 65 to column 15, line 1). In other words, the Utsumi reference also fails to teach or suggest a set top terminal as conventionally known by a person of ordinary skill in the art and as also defined by the Applicants.

Moreover, even if these two references could somehow be operably combined the combination would merely disclose a server providing graphical and video information to a client device such as a PC, PDA, Unix desk top system and the like where a terminal-type determining section provides information to a data exchange process section to perform a series of processing operations to convert data as an application service into another data in correspondence with the attribute of each terminal or communication infrastructure. This is completely different from the Applicants' invention. Specifically, the Applicants' invention is a multimedia video-on-demand (VOD) system that provides video content and navigational information in the form of graphical data, which is sent to a set top terminal that is able to selectively tune, demodulate, and depacketize user content and assets provided via at least one of a plurality of transmission channels.

It is noted that the video-on-demand services, as conventionally known by a person of ordinary skill in the art, include providing such video content (e.g. movies) to the subscribers through the set top terminal such that a subscriber may view such video content and interact with the navigational screen so that the content may be viewed in a VCR-like manner (i.e., having fast forward, rewind, stop, pause, play commands). None

Serial No. 09/458,321
Page 11 of 13

of the devices as described in the Shaw and Utsumi references are considered by a person of ordinary skill in the art as "a set top terminal" that are configured to "selectively tune, downconvert, and depacketize video content and assets received via said transmission channels." Therefore, the Shaw and Utsumi references fail to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as a whole.

Furthermore, neither the Shaw or Utsumi reference teaches or suggests "selecting, from a plurality of available video content and navigational asset versions stored on said service provider equipment, one of said versions of video content and navigational assets appropriate to said capability level of said STT." That is, the Applicants invention stores various versions of the video content and navigational assets at the service provider equipment. In particular,

"In response to a user request for particular content, the session controller 145 causes the requested content file to be streamed to the transport processor 150. Additionally, the session controller 145 utilizes the mapping data 145-MD to determine which asset data stream or file (if any) is associated with the requested content stream or file. The session controller 145 causes the associated asset stream or file to be streamed to the transport processor 150 from the asset storage module 125." (see Applicants' specification page 7, lines 22-28, and Fig. 1).

By contrast, the Shaw reference teaches downloading a display engine from the service provider equipment and the appropriate protocol engine translates the standard protocol request into an adaptive internet protocol that the display engine on the client device can display (see Shaw, col. 8, lines 1-25). Nowhere in the Shaw reference is there any teaching or suggestion of storing a plurality of available video content and navigational asset versions on the service provider equipment, where one of the versions is appropriate to the capability level of said STT. Therefore, the Shaw reference fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as a whole.

Furthermore, the Utsumi reference merely discloses a server having a data management section for managing attribute data representing the processing capability such as a CPU capability, a display capability, and a memory capacity of each terminal connected to the server (see Utsumi, col. 15, line 56 to col. 16, line 51). However, nowhere in either reference, either singularly or in combination, is there any teaching or

Serial No. 09/458,321
Page 12 of 13

suggestion of "selecting, from a plurality of available video content and navigational asset versions stored on said service provider equipment, one of said versions of video content and navigational assets appropriate to said capability level of said STT." Therefore, the combined references fail to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as a whole.

As such, the Applicants submit that claim 10 is not obvious and fully satisfies the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §103 as patentable thereunder. Likewise, independent claims 17 and 23, as amended, recites similar limitations as recited in independent claim 10. As such, the Applicants submit that claims 17 and 23 are not obvious and fully satisfy the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §103 as patentable thereunder. Furthermore, claims 11-13, 15, 18, 20-22, and 24-29 respectively depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 10, 17, and 23 and recite additional features thereof. As such, and for at least the same reasons as discussed above, the Applicants submit that these dependent claims are also not obvious and fully satisfy the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Serial No. 09/458,321
Page 13 of 13

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Conclusion

Thus, the Applicants submit that claims 10-13, 15-18, and 20-29 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Steven M. Hertzberg or Eamon J. Wall, Esqs. at (732) 530-9404 so appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

10/16/03

E J Wall
Eamon J. Wall, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,414
(732) 530-9404

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 17 2003

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
Attorneys at Law
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

OFFICIAL